

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-16 and 18-32 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 5, 18, and 30-32 have been amended as shown at pages 2-6 of the Reply.

Applicants' representative thanks Examiners for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interviews conducted on September 12, 2007. Examiners were contacted to discuss the claim objection and rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a). During the interview a set of amendments were presented to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) identified in the Office Action. Examiners indicated that the amendments overcome the rejections. These amendments have been incorporated into the claims as shown above. Examiners also indicated that further search and consideration was required to determine if the claims would be allowed over the cited prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

#### **I. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 9-12 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Garg, *et al.* (US 6,289,458). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Garg, *et al.* does not teach each and every element of the subject invention as recited in the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc., v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 U.S.P.Q.2D 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The subject claims relates to verification of permission for an entity to access objects in multiple entity shared environment. For example, in a subscription and billing system, where multiple tenants have data stored in a shared database, access to data and objects can be

restricted such that a first tenant does not have access to data or objects accessible by a second tenant. There may also be objects that both tenants can access. Furthermore, a first entity can act as a proxy for a second entity to access an object, such as a particular subscription, not directly accessible by the second entity. In particular, independent claim 1 recites *a system that facilitates access to a plurality of shared software objects by disparate entities, comprising: a platform component that receives a request to access an object by an entity, wherein the entity requests access to an object on behalf of another entity, the entity and the another entity are each an individual human or a business; a data store that stores security information on classes of the objects; and a verification component that employs the security information to verify that the entity has permission to call an Application Programming Interface (API) for the object and/or operate on the object, the verification component permits the another entity to call or operate on the object upon verification that the entity has the permission.*

Garg, *et al.* does not teach or suggest the aforementioned novel features as recited in the subject claim. The cited reference discloses a system for managing access rights to objects, as well as, individual or sets of properties or objects within an object. However, the access rights are related to an entity directly accessing an object for themselves. The cited reference is silent regarding an entity requesting access to an object on behalf of another entity as taught in the subject claim. The Office Action attempts to cite Figure 1 which shows a user making a request and a service processing the request as teaching the two entities of this feature. Claim 1 has been further amended to clarify that an entity is a human or business and that, for example, one business is making the access request on behalf of another business. Garg, *et al.* doesn't teach an entity as recited in the amended claim employing its access privileges on behalf of another entity. Therefore, Garg, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest a platform component that receives a request to access an object by an entity, wherein the entity requests access to an object on behalf of another entity, the entity and the another entity are each an individual human or a business; a data store that stores security information on classes of the objects; and a verification component that employs the security information to verify that the entity has permission to call an Application Programming Interface (API) for the object and/or operate on the object, the verification component permits the another entity to call or operate on the object upon verification that the entity has the permission.

In view of the foregoing, applicants' representative respectfully submits that Garg, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest all limitations of independent claims 1 (and claims 2, 3, 5, 6 and 9-12 that depend there from), and thus fails to anticipate the subject claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

## **II. Rejection of Claims 18-32 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 18-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Corrigan, *et al.* (US 6,640,097). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Corrigan, *et al.* does not teach each and every element of the subject invention as recited in the subject claims.

Independent claim 18 (and similarly independent claims 31 and 32) recites *storing one or more security options in a database, the security options related to an automated billing and provisioning system, wherein the security options include at least conversion of a subscription from a first type to a second type*. The subject claims disclose security options that support restricting conversion of a subscription from a first type to a second type, for example to prevent one tenant from stealing another tenant's subscriber. The Office Action dated July 16, 2007 cites column 4, lines 22-25 of Corrigan, *et al.* as disclosing the security option recited in the subject claims. However, the cited reference makes a general statement regarding controlling service offering, but does not disclose the security option disclosed in the claim. Corrigan, *et al.* is concerned with WAP provisioning and silent regarding security options including at least conversion of a subscription from a first type to a second type.

Moreover independent claim 30 recites *means for authenticating at least one entity attempting access to an online billing and service, wherein the entity is attempting access on behalf of another entity, the entity and the another entity are each an individual human or a business; means for authorizing the at least one entity or authorizing the another entity upon authorization of the at least one entity; and means for associating a security parameter with at least one business object from a globalized region of a database*. Corrigan, *et al.* fails to disclose this novel feature of the subject claim. The section of the prior art reference cited in the Office Action discloses WAP services platform where the server hosting the service can be located at WAP network operators own domain or another domain. This is merely discussing the location of the server hosting the services that the WAP user is accessing. However, the WAP user is

accessing the server hosting the services on their own behalf, not on behalf of another WAP user. The Office Action dated July 16, 2007 attempts to cite Figure 5 as teaching the two entities recited in the subject claim. Figure 5 merely discloses a WTA server that processes mobile networking services for users. The subject claim has been amended to further clarify that an entity is a human or business. Corrigan, *et al.* doesn't teach an entity as recited in the amended claim employing its access privileges on behalf of another entity. Therefore, Corrigan, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest means for authenticating at least one entity attempting access to an online billing and service, wherein the entity is attempting access on behalf of another entity, the entity and the another entity are each an individual human or a business; means for authorizing the at least one entity or authorizing the another entity upon authorization of the at least one entity.

In view of the foregoing, applicants' representative respectfully submits that Corrigan, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest all limitations of independent claims 18 and 30-32 (and claims 19-29 that depend there from), and thus fails to anticipate the subject claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### **III. Rejection of Claims 4, 7, 8 and 13-17 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 4, 7, 8 and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Corrigan, *et al.* It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Garg, *et al.* in view of Corrigan, *et al.* does not teach each and every element of applicants' invention as recited in the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on

applicant's disclosure. *See In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Claims 4, 7, 8 and 13-17 depend from independent claims 1. As discussed above, Garg, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest all limitations of independent claim 1. Moreover, as noted *supra* with respect to the similar limitations of claim 30, Corrigan, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest *a system that facilitates access to a plurality of shared software objects by disparate entities, comprising: a platform component that receives a request to access an object by an entity, wherein the entity requests access to an object on behalf of another entity, the entity and the another entity are each an individual human or a business; a data store that stores security information on classes of the objects; and a verification component that employs the security information to verify that the entity has permission to call an Application Programming Interface (API) for the object and/or operate on the object, the verification component permits the another entity to call or operate on the object upon verification that the entity has the permission.* Both references teach an entity accessing an object on their own behalf.

Accordingly, applicants' representative respectfully submits that Garg, *et al.* and Corrigan, *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of applicants' invention as recited in independent claim 1 (and claims 4, 7, 8 and 13-17 that depend there from), and thus fails to make obvious the subject claimed invention. As such, this rejection should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP502US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731